



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,204	03/05/2002	Herbert T. Ong	5681-10600	6378

7590 02/07/2007
Robert C. Kowert
Conley, Rose & Tayon, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HAI V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/091,204

Applicant(s)

ONG ET AL.

Examiner

Hai V. Nguyen

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-17,19-29,31-42 and 44-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-17,19-29,31-42 and 44-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/04/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the communication received on 17 November 2006.
2. Claims 4, 18, 30 and 43 are cancelled.
3. Claims 1-3, 5-17, 19-29, 31-42, and 44-48 are presented for examination.
4. The co-pending applications are 10/090,893 and 10/091,203.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments see Applicant's remark, pages 19-30 filed on 17 November 2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 3 under USC 102(e) and USC 103(a) rejection(s) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of **Wyler** US patent #: **7,047,033 B2**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102(e) that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-3, 5-17, 19-29, 31-42, and 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Wyler et al. 7,047,033 B2**.

Art Unit: 2142

8. As to claim 1, Wyler discloses the invention as claimed, including a system comprising:

a server (*a mobile server or a server located on the premises of a content provider, col. 14, line 46; col. 27, lines 20-28; lines 51-62; col. 28, lines 20-31, 42-50*) configured to store documents (*document/webpage*) in one or more server format(s) (*book format style, pamphlet, booklet, article, news paper look, col. 24, lines 12-53*) each supported by one or more application(s) (*news, article, image, text*) of the server, wherein the server, wherein the documents are available to one or more device(s) (*mobile or electronic portable devices, PDAs*) via a network (*Internet*);

a small device (*Figs. 22-30, a PDA device or a wireless device, a telephone and personal digital assistant, PalmPilot*) configured to couple to the server (*Fig. 18, col. 27, line 16 – col. 28, line 50*);

wherein the server is further configured to plug a converter module (*insertion of M2O script*) into a framework (*a core process, col. 11, line 38*) configured to accept one or more pluggable module(s) (*Fig. 1, scripts 20, 30, 40*).

wherein the converter module is configured to generate a document in a small device format (*Figs. 5, 18; col. 12, lines 30-37*); and

wherein the server is further configured to provide the document in the small device format to the small device (*Figs. 5, 18; col. 12, lines 30-37*).

wherein the converter module is further is configured to

receive a modified version of the document in the small device format from the small device (*receiving filtering criteria settings from user, col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 17; col. 23, line 44 – col. 25, line 10*); and generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the document in the small device format (*col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 17; col. 23, line 44 – col. 25, line 10*).

9. As to claim 2, Wyler discloses, wherein the server formats include office document formats (*col. 19, lines 14-20; col. 25, lines 5-9*).
10. As to claim 3, Wyler discloses, wherein, to generate a document in one of the one or more small device formats, the converter module is further configured to exclude (*to exclude, col. 23, lines 49-52; to discard, Fig. 33, box 1670, col. 32, lines 10-25*) one or more format features (*objects*) of the document in the server format from the document in the small device format (*col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25*).
11. As to claim 5, Wyler discloses, wherein, to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the document in the small device format, the converter module is further configured to restore one or more format features (*objects*) of the document in the server format excluded from the document in the small device format (*col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25*).
12. As to claim 6, Wyler discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a merger module into the framework (*Figs. 6, 7; col. 17, line 51 col. 18, line 10*); and wherein the merger module is configured to merge the modified version

Art Unit: 2142

of the document in the server format with the document in the server format to generate a synchronized version of the document in the server format (*Figs. 6, 7; col. 17, line 51 - col. 18, line 10; col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 18; col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25*).

13. As to claim 7, Wyler discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a differencing module (*filtering, classifying*) into the framework, and wherein the differencing module is configured to determine differences (*relevance or irrelevance*) between the modified version of the document in the server format and the document in the server format (*Figs. 6, 7; col. 17, line 51 - col. 18, line 10; col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 18; col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25*); and provide the determined differences to the merger module, wherein each determined difference indicates changed content of the modified version of the document in the server format (*Figs. 6, 7; col. 17, line 51 - col. 18, line 10; col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 18; col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25*).

14. As to claim 8, Wyler discloses, wherein, for each of the determined differences, the merger module is further configured to merge corresponding changed content of the modified version of the document in the server format with the document in the server format (*Figs. 6, 7; col. 17, line 51 - col. 18, line 10; col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 18; col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25*).

15. As to claim 9, Wyler discloses, receiving a modified version of the document in the small device format from the small device (*Figs. 6, 7; col. 17, line 51 - col. 18, line 10; col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 18; col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25*).

Art Unit: 2142

plug a merger module into the framework (*inserting M2O scripts, Figs. 6, 7; col. 17, line 51 - col. 18, line 10; col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 18; col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25*);

plug a differencing module into the framework (*inserting M2O scripts, a Figs. 6, 7; col. 17, line 51 - col. 18, line 10; col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 18; col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25*);

generate a version of the document in an interim format (*Fig. 1, a M2O script format*) from the document in the server format (*Figs. 5A-5B, col. 14, lines 27-45*);

wherein the converter module is further configured to generate a modified version of the document in the interim format from the modified version of the document in the small device format (*Figs. 5A-5B, col. 14, lines 27-67*);

wherein the differencing module is configured to determine differences between the modified version of the document in the interim format and the version of the document in the interim format, wherein each determined difference indicates changed content of the modified version of the document in the interim format (*Figs. 6, 7; col. 17, line 51 - col. 18, line 10; col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 18; col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25*);

wherein, for each of the determined differences, the merger module is further configured to merge corresponding changed content of the modified version of the document in the interim format with the version of the document in the interim format to generate a synchronized version of the document in the

Art Unit: 2142

interim format (*Figs. 6, 7; col. 17, line 51 - col. 18, line 10; col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 18; col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25*).

16. As to claim 10, Wyler discloses wherein the server is further configured to generate a synchronized version of the document in the server format from the synchronized version of the document in the interim format (*Figs. 6, 7; col. 17, line 51 - col. 18, line 10; col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 18; col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25; col. 35, lines 3-15*).

17. As to claim 11, Wyler discloses, wherein the server is further configured to: unplug (*remove*) the converter module from the framework; plug (*insert*) a different converter module into the framework (*Fig. 33; col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 18; col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25; col. 35, lines 3-15*).

18. As to claim 12, Wyler discloses, wherein the different converter module is configured to generate documents in a different one of the one or more small device formats from documents in a different one of the one or more server formats; and generate modified versions of documents in the different server format from modified versions of documents in the different small device format (*Fig. 33; col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 18; col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25; col. 35, lines 3-15*).

19. As to claim 13, Wyler discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a merger module into the framework, wherein the merger module is configured to merge modified versions of documents in the server format with corresponding original versions of the documents in the server format to generate synchronized versions of the documents in the server format (*Fig. 33;*

Art Unit: 2142

col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 18; col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25; col. 35, lines 3-15).

20. As to claim 14, Wyler discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a differencing module into the framework, wherein the differencing module is configured to determine differences between modified versions of documents in the server format and corresponding original versions of the documents in the server format (*Fig. 33; col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 18; col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25; col. 35, lines 3-15*).

21. As to claim 15, Wyler discloses, wherein the server comprises a converter factory (*Fig. 2, levels 2, 3*) configured to generate the converter module, the merger module and the differencing module for plugging into the framework (*col. 11, line 37 – col. 12, line 37; col. 14, lines 12-67; col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 18; col. 23, lines 49-52, col. 32, lines 10-25; col. 35, lines 3-15*).

22. Claim 16 corresponds the apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 1.

23. Claims 17-24 introduce identical limitations of claims 3-10; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 3-10.

24. Claim 25 introduces identical limitations of claims 11, 12; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 11, 12.

25. Claims 26-28 introduce identical limitations of claims 13-15; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 13-15.

26. Claim 29 corresponds the method claim of claims 1, 3; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 1, 3.

Art Unit: 2142

27. Claim 30 introduces identical limitations of claims 4, 5; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 4, 5.

28. Claims 31-32 introduce identical limitations of claims 6-7; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 6-7.

29. Claims 33-34 introduce identical limitations of claims 9-10; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 9-10.

30. Claim 35 introduces identical limitations of claims 9, 7; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 9, 7.

31. Claim 36 introduces identical limitation of claim 10; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 10.

32. Claims 37-38 introduce identical limitations of claims 12-13; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 12-13.

33. Claim 39 introduces identical limitations of claims 11, 12; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 11, 12.

34. Claim 40 introduces identical limitation of claim 9; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 9.

35. Claim 41 introduces identical limitation of claim 13; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 13.

36. Claim 42 corresponds the article of manufacture claim of claims 1, 3; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 1, 3.

37. Claim 43 introduces identical limitations of claims 4, 5; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 4, 5.

Art Unit: 2142

38. Claim 44 introduces identical limitation of claim 7; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 7.

39. Claim 45 introduces identical limitations of claims 9, 10; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 9, 10.

40. Claim 46 introduces identical limitations of claims 12, 11; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 10, 11.

41. Claims 47, 48 introduce identical limitations of claims 12, 13; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 12, 13.

42. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892, which is an attachment to this action.

Art Unit: 2142



Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai V. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3901. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00-3:30 Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hai V. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2142



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER